



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/525,344	02/22/2005	Gidon Ebenshpanger	29388	3634
7590	11/15/2005		EXAMINER	
Martin Moynihan Anthony Castorina Suite 207 2001 Jefferson Davis Highway Arlington, VA 22202			SANTIAGO CORDERO, MARIVELISSE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2687	
DATE MAILED: 11/15/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/525,344	EBENSHPANGER, GIDON	
	Examiner Marivelisse Santiago-Cordero	Art Unit 2687	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                            2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 22 February 2005 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

1. The references cited in the Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) filed on 11/01/2005 have been considered.

### ***Oath/Declaration***

2. The Oath/Declaration filed on 2/22/05 is objected to because it is not clear if the sole or first inventor's signature is present.

### ***Drawings***

3. The drawings are objected to because the arrow that represents the Connection Verification Signal (118) is facing the wrong direction (Figs. 1A-C); the specification on page 9, lines 8-10 states that a Connection Verification Signal 118 is generated by base station disconnect detector 120; however, the arrow demonstrate otherwise.

4. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the limitation of "sending a disconnect message from said disconnected telephone to a base station" a stated in claim 28 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing-sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must

be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the examiner does not accept the changes, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

In addition to Replacement Sheets containing the corrected drawing figure(s), applicant is required to submit a marked-up copy of each Replacement Sheet including annotations indicating the changes made to the previous version. The marked-up copy must be clearly labeled as "Annotated Sheets" and must be presented in the amendment or remarks section that explains the change(s) to the drawings. See 37 CFR 1.121(d)(1). Failure to timely submit the proposed drawing and marked-up copy will result in the abandonment of the application.

*Specification*

5. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: the term "from the" (page 7, line 4) should be deleted. Appropriate correction is required.
6. The use of the trademark BLUETOOTH has been noted in this application. It should be capitalized wherever it appears and be accompanied by the generic terminology.

Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

***Claim Objections***

7. Claims 1-14 are objected to because of the following informalities: the term "anda" (claim 1, line 7) should be separated to --and a--. Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

9. Claims 1-3, 5-6, 9-11, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ahuja (Patent No.: 5,752,185).

Regarding claim 1, Ahuja discloses a system for producing a disconnect indicator after one of a plurality of cellular telephones (col. 2, lines 33-37) engaged in communication disconnects (from col. 1, line 63 through col. 2, line 6), the system comprising: a cellular base station (Fig. 1; col. 4, lines 46-51); a connection verification generator for generating a connection verification signal (col. 4, lines 64-67); a disconnect indicator associated with at least one cellular telephone (col. 4, lines 54-62); and a verification response detector for confirming the connection of a cellular telephone (col. 4, line 64 thorough col. 5, line 8), and in the absence of a verification response confirming a disconnection of a cellular telephone (col. 5, lines 15-19), whereby in the event of a disconnection said disconnect indicator is operated (col. 5, lines 15-19).

Regarding claim 2, Ahuja discloses the system according to claim 1, wherein the disconnection is caused when one of the plurality of cellular telephones engaged in communication loses connectivity with the cellular base station (col. 4, lines 46-51).

Regarding claim 3, Ahuja discloses the system according to claim 1, wherein the disconnection is caused when one of the plurality of cellular telephones engaged in communication actively disconnects (from col. 4, line 46 through col. 5, line 19).

Regarding claim 5, Ahuja discloses the system according to claim 3, wherein one of the plurality of cellular telephones engaged in communication is unintentionally disconnected by a user (from col. 1, line 63 through col. 2, line 6).

Regarding claim 6, Ahuja discloses the system according to claim 1, wherein said disconnect indicators is chosen from the group consisting of a ringing tone, a humming, a vibration, a recorded voice message and a visual indicator (col. 4, lines 60-62).

Regarding claim 9, Ahuja discloses the system according to claim 1, wherein the plurality of cellular telephones engaged in communication are engaged in communication on a party-line (col. 2, lines 33-37).

Regarding claim 10, Ahuja discloses the system according to claim 9, wherein each of the plurality of cellular telephones which are still engaged in communication display the disconnect indicator (col. 2, lines 33-37; col. 4, lines 54-62).

Regarding claim 11, Ahuja discloses the system according to claim 1, wherein the plurality of cellular telephones engaged in communication comprise all cellular telephone subscribers on a given cellular telephone network (Fig. 1).

Regarding claim 30, Ahuja discloses a system for producing a disconnect indicator after one of a plurality of communication devices engaged in communication disconnects, the system comprising: a central communication station for communicating with the communication device (Fig. 1, reference numeral 50); a connection verification generator for generating a connection verification signal (col. 4, lines 64-67); a disconnect indicator associated with at least one communication device (col. 4, lines 53-62); and a verification response detector for confirming the connection of the communication device (from col. 4, line 64 through col. 5, line 8), and in the absence of a verification response confirming a disconnection of the communication device (col. 5, lines 15-19), whereby in the event of a disconnection said disconnect indicator is operated (col. 5, lines 15-19).

10. Claims 15-17, 19-25, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Forman et al. (hereinafter “Forman”; Pub. No.: US 2004/0203645).

Regarding claim 15, Forman discloses a system for producing a disconnect indicator in which one of a plurality of cellular telephones engaged in communication disconnects (page 1, paragraphs [0016]-[0017]), the system comprising: a disconnection detector at one of the plurality of cellular telephones for detecting a disconnection to at least one other cellular telephone (page 1, paragraphs [0016]-[0017]), and for causing said cellular telephone to produce the disconnect indicator (page 1, paragraphs [0016]-[0017]).

Regarding claim 16, Forman discloses the system according to claim 15, wherein the disconnection is caused when one of the plurality of cellular telephones engaged in communication loses connectivity with the cellular base station (page 1, paragraph [0009] and [0016]).

Regarding claim 17, Forman discloses the system according to claim 15, wherein the disconnection is caused when one of the plurality of cellular telephones engaged in communication disconnects (page 1, paragraph [0017]).

Regarding claim 19, Forman discloses the system according to claim 17, wherein one of the plurality of cellular telephones engaged in communication is unintentionally disconnected by a user (page 1, paragraph [0016]).

Regarding claim 20, Forman discloses the system according to claim 17, wherein the plurality of cellular telephones engaged in communication are engaged in communication through multi-party communication (page 2, paragraph [0025]).

Regarding claim 21, Forman discloses the system according to claim 20, wherein each of the cellular telephones which are still engaged in communication display the disconnect indicator (page 2, paragraph [0018]).

Regarding claim 22, Forman discloses the system according to claim 17, wherein the plurality of cellular telephones engaged in communication are engaged in communication on a party-line (page 2, paragraph [0018]).

Regarding claim 23, Forman discloses the system according to claim 17, wherein each of the plurality of cellular telephones which are still engaged in communication display the disconnect indicator (page 2, paragraph [0018]).

Regarding claim 24, Forman discloses the system according to claim 17, wherein the plurality of cellular telephones engaged in communication comprise all cellular telephone subscribers on a given cellular telephone network (Fig. 1B; page 1, paragraph [0008]).

Regarding claim 25, Forman discloses the system according to claim 20 wherein the plurality of cellular telephones engaged in communication comprise cellular telephone subscribers on a given cellular telephone network who have paid a fee (page 2, paragraph [0026]).

Regarding claim 29, Forman discloses a method for producing a disconnect indicator in which one of a plurality of cellular telephones engaged in communication disconnects, producing a disconnection (page 1, paragraphs [0016]-[0017]), the method comprising: establishing a telephone call transmission between a plurality of cellular telephones (page 1, paragraphs [0008], [0016]-[0017]); disconnecting at least one of said plurality of cellular telephones from said telephone call transmission (page 1, paragraphs [0016]-[0017]); detecting the disconnection with at least one disconnect detector operatively associated with at least one of the plurality of cellular telephones (page 1, paragraphs [0016]-[0017]); displaying a display indicator on the cellular telephone (page 1, paragraphs [0016]-[0017]).

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.

Art Unit: 2687

2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

13. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ahuja in view of Brooks et al. (hereinafter “Brooks”; Pub. No.: US 2002/0090947).

Regarding claim 4, Ahuja discloses the system according to claim 3 (see above). Ahuja fails to disclose wherein one of the plurality of cellular telephones engaged in communication is intentionally disconnected by a user.

However, in the same field of endeavor, Brooks discloses wherein one of the plurality of cellular telephones engaged in communication is intentionally disconnected by a user (page 2, paragraph [0021]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention by applicant to intentionally disconnect one of the plurality of cellular telephones of Ahuja intentionally by a user as suggested by Brooks.

One of ordinary skill in this art would have been motivated to disconnect one of the plurality of cellular telephones intentionally by a user because it is notoriously well-known in the art that most conversations end with one of the parties hanging-up.

14. Claims 7-8 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ahuja in view of Forman.

Regarding claim 7, Ahuja discloses the system according to claim 1 (see above), wherein the plurality of cellular telephones engaged in communication are engaged in communication (Fig. 1). Ahuja fail to disclose through multi-party communication.

However, in the same field of endeavor, Forman discloses wherein the plurality of cellular telephones engaged in communication are engaged in communication through multi-party communication (page 2, paragraph [0025]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention by applicant to engage the communication of Ahuja through a multi-party communication as suggested by Forman.

One of ordinary skill in this art would have been motivated to engage the communication through a multi-party communication because it can be expanded and adapted for conference calling (Forman: page 2, paragraph [0025]).

Regarding claim 8, in the obvious combination, Ahuja discloses wherein each of the cellular telephones which are still engaged in communication display the disconnect indicator (col. 2, lines 33-37; col. 4, lines 54-62).

Regarding claim 12, Ahuja discloses the system according to claim 1 (see above) wherein the plurality of cellular telephones engaged in communication comprise cellular telephone subscribers on a given cellular telephone network (Fig. 1). Ahuja fails to disclose who have paid a fee.

However, in the same field of endeavor, Forman discloses wherein the plurality of cellular telephones engaged in communication comprise cellular telephone subscribers on a given cellular telephone network who have paid a fee (page 2, paragraph [0026]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention by applicant to engage in communication the cellular telephone subscribers on a given cellular network of Ahuja who have paid a fee as suggested by Forman.

One of ordinary skill in this art would have been motivated to engage in communication the cellular telephone subscribers on a given cellular network who have paid a fee because a provider can offer the system capability and technique as a distinguishing feature of their method of doing business (Forman: page 2, paragraph [0026])).

15. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ahuja in view of Duerk et al. (hereinafter “Duerk”; Pub. No.: US 2003/0134617).

Regarding claim 13, Ahuja discloses the system according to claim 1 (see above). Ahuja fails to disclose wherein the plurality of cellular telephones engaged in communication comprise all cellular telephone subscribers on a combination of cellular telephone networks.

However, in the same field of endeavor, Duerk discloses wherein the plurality of cellular telephones engaged in communication comprise all cellular telephone subscribers on a combination of cellular telephone networks (Fig. 2; page 3, paragraph [0025]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention by applicant to engage in communication all cellular telephone subscribers of Ahuja on a combination of cellular telephone networks as suggested by Duerk.

One of ordinary skill in this art would have been motivated to engage in communication all cellular telephone subscribers on a combination of cellular telephone networks because it was commonly known in the art, at the time the invention was made, that cellular telephones could subscribe to the cellular network of their preference choosing from a vast selection of wireless networks; moreover, conversations between different users of different networks can be established in order to expand the communication system.

16. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ahuja in views of Duerk and Forman.

Regarding claim 14, Ahuja discloses the system according to claim 1 (see above). Ahuja fails to disclose wherein the plurality of cellular telephones engaged in communication comprise all cellular telephone subscribers on a combination of cellular telephone networks who have paid a fee.

However, in the same field of endeavor, Duerk discloses wherein the plurality of cellular telephones engaged in communication comprise all cellular telephone subscribers on a combination of cellular telephone networks (Fig. 2; page 3, paragraph [0025]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention by applicant to engage in communication all cellular telephone subscribers of Ahuja on a combination of cellular telephone networks as suggested by Duerk.

One of ordinary skill in this art would have been motivated to engage in communication all cellular telephone subscribers on a combination of cellular telephone networks because it was commonly known in the art, at the time the invention was made, that cellular telephones could subscribe to the cellular network of their preference choosing from a vast selection of wireless networks; moreover, conversations between different users of different networks can be established in order to expand the communication system.

Ahuja in combination with Duerk fail to disclose cellular telephone subscribers who have paid a fee.

However, in the same field of endeavor, Forman discloses cellular telephone subscribers who have paid a fee (page 2, paragraph [0026]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention by applicant to engage in communication the cellular telephone subscribers on a combination of cellular telephone networks of Ahuja in combination with Duerk who have paid a fee as suggested by Forman.

One of ordinary skill in this art would have been motivated to engage in communication the cellular telephone subscribers on a combination of cellular telephone networks who have paid a fee because a provider can offer the system capability and technique as a distinguishing feature of their method of doing business (Forman: page 2, paragraph [0026]).

17. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Forman in view of Brooks.

Regarding claim 18, Forman discloses the system according to claim 17 (see above). Forman fails to disclose wherein one of the plurality of cellular telephones engaged in communication is intentionally disconnected by a user.

However, in the same field of endeavor, Brooks discloses wherein one of the plurality of cellular telephones engaged in communication is intentionally disconnected by a user (page 2, paragraph [0021]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention by applicant to intentionally disconnect one of the plurality of cellular telephones of Forman intentionally by a user as suggested by Brooks.

One of ordinary skill in this art would have been motivated to disconnect one of the plurality of cellular telephones intentionally by a user because it was notoriously well-known in

the art, at the time the invention was made, that most conversations end with one of the parties hanging-up.

18. Claims 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Forman in view of Duerk.

Regarding claim 26, Forman discloses the system according to claim 20 (see above). Forman fails to disclose wherein the plurality of cellular telephones engaged in communication comprise all cellular telephone subscribers on a combination of cellular telephone networks.

However, in the same field of endeavor, Duerk discloses wherein the plurality of cellular telephones engaged in communication comprise all cellular telephone subscribers on a combination of cellular telephone networks (Fig. 2; page 3, paragraph [0025]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention by applicant to engage in communication all cellular telephone subscribers of Forman on a combination of cellular telephone networks as suggested by Duerk.

One of ordinary skill in this art would have been motivated to engage in communication all cellular telephone subscribers on a combination of cellular telephone networks because it was commonly known in the art, at the time the invention was made, that cellular telephones could subscribe to the cellular network of their preference choosing from a vast selection of wireless networks; moreover, conversations between different users of different networks can be established in order to expand the communication system.

Regarding claim 27, Forman discloses the system according to claim 20 (see above) wherein the plurality of cellular telephones engaged in communication comprise cellular telephone subscribers who have paid a fee (page 2, paragraph [0026]).

Forman fails to disclose on a combination of cellular telephone networks.

However, in the same field of endeavor, Duerk discloses wherein the plurality of cellular telephones engaged in communication comprise all cellular telephone subscribers on a combination of cellular telephone networks (Fig. 2; page 3, paragraph [0025]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention by applicant to engage in communication all cellular telephone subscribers of Forman on a combination of cellular telephone networks as suggested by Duerk.

One of ordinary skill in this art would have been motivated to engage in communication all cellular telephone subscribers on a combination of cellular telephone networks because it was commonly known in the art, at the time the invention was made, that cellular telephones could subscribe to the cellular network of their preference choosing from a vast selection of wireless networks; moreover, conversations between different users of different networks can be established in order to expand the communication system.

19. Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brooks.

Regarding claim 28, Brooks discloses, in a typical embodiment, a method for producing a disconnect indicator in which one of a plurality of cellular telephones engaged in communication disconnects (page 2, paragraph [0007]), the method comprising: establishing a telephone call transmission between a plurality of cellular telephones (page 2, paragraph [0019]); disconnecting at least one of said plurality of cellular telephones from said telephone call transmission (page 2, paragraph [0021]); sending a disconnect message from said disconnected telephone (page 2, paragraph [0021]; note the “far end”) to a base station (page 2, paragraph [0021]); sending a

Art Unit: 2687

disconnect message from said base station to other cellular telephone (page 2, paragraph [0021]; note the "mobile station 106").

Brooks fails to disclose, in that typical embodiment, displaying a display indicator on said other cellular telephone.

However, in an alternate embodiment, Brooks discloses a method for producing a disconnect indicator in which one of a plurality of cellular telephones engaged in communication disconnects (page 2, paragraph [0007]) and displaying a display indicator on said other cellular telephone (page 2, paragraph [0024]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention by applicant to display a display indicator on said other cellular telephone as suggested by Brook because it would indicate to the user that service was interrupted (Brooks: page 1, paragraph [0007]).

### *Conclusion*

20. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marivelisse Santiago-Cordero whose telephone number is (571) 272-7839. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 7:30am to 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lester Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-7922. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

msc 11/10/05  
MSC

  
11/10/05  
ELISEO RAMOS-FELICIANO  
PATENT EXAMINER